



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/438,247	11/12/1999	JUNJI NISHIGAKI	15162/01290	9067
24367	7590	07/14/2004	EXAMINER	
SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP 717 NORTH HARWOOD SUITE 3400 DALLAS, TX 75201			KASSA, YOSEF	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2625	12
DATE MAILED: 07/14/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/438,247	NISHIGAKI ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	YOSEF KASSA	2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 April 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-13 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 4 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 November 1999 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments see the remark on page 5-8, filed on Apr. 26, 2004, with respect to rejection(s) of claims 1-13 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made on view of Hata et al U.S. Patent 4,606,066, and further in view of Lotspiech U.S. Patent 4,271,476.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 and 5-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hata et al (U.S. Patent 4,606,066), and further in view of Lotspiech (U.S. Patent 4,271,476).

With regard to claim 1, Hata et al discloses a plurality of processors (see Fig. 2, item 10) processing input image data in parallel with each other (see col. 3, lines 13-20) and outputting respective processed image data (see col. 3, lines 30-33); an address memory storing address information (see col. 3, lines 16-23) for each respective portion

or image data being processed by each of plurality of processors (see col. 2, lines 18-30 and col. 3, lines 7-12).

Hata et al did not explicitly call for the address information is related to a position of each portion of input image data within the input image data. However, at the same field of endeavor, Lotspiech teaches this feature (see col. 3, lines 1-14). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of Lotspiech rotated image processing system into Hata et al system. The motivation for doing so is to combine the rotated section an image to form the completed image.

With regard to claim 2, Hata et al disclose an image memory storing image data output from plurality of processors (see col. 3, lines 30-37), and read means reading image data from image memory on the basis of address information stored in address memory (see col. 4, lines 67-col. 5, lines 9).

With regard to claim 3, Hata et al disclose an image memory storing image data output from plurality of processors along the sequence of addresses on the basis of address information stored in address memory (see col. 3, lines 13-23).

With regard to claim 5, Hata et al discloses plurality of processors also output arrangement information corresponding to processed data when outputting data (see col. 3, lines 13-22).

Claim 6 is similarly analyzed as claim 1. As to the additional limitation of a controller restoring a single image from plurality of data processed. However, at the same field of endeavor, Lotspiech teaches this feature (see col. 2, lines 37-42). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of

Lotspiech's image data combining process into Hata et al system. The motivation for doing so is to combine a rotated section of an image to form a completed image.

Claims 7 and 8 are similarly analyzed as claims 2 and 3.

With regard to claim 9, Hata et al discloses first memory is provided in correspondence to each of plurality of processors (see Fig 2, item 14).

Claim 10 is similarly analyzed as claim 5.

Claim 11 is similarly analyzed as claims 1 and 6. As to the additional limitation of dividing input image data into a plurality of image data. At the same field of endeavor, Lotspiech teaches this feature (see col. 2, lines 36-40). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of Lotspiech's image dividing system into Hata et al system. The motivation for doing so is to combine a divided section of an image to form a completed image.

Claim 12 is similarly analyzed as claims 1 and 6. As to the additional limitation of a data flow control, coupled to first and second processors for coordinating the operation. At the same field of endeavor, Lotspiech teaches this feature (see col. 3, lines 7-12). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of Lotspiech's controller system into Hata et al system. The motivation for doing so is to control plurality of processors for processing an image data.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

3. Claim 4 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Other Prior Art Cited***

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Patent No. (5,920,646) to Kamon discloses digital copying apparatus capable of forming a superior...

US Patent No. (6,393,162) to Higurashi discloses image synthesizing apparatus.

US Patent No. (4,894,646) to Ryman discloses method and system for processing...

US Patent No. (6,263,118) to Kanno et al discloses image processing apparatus.

***Conclusion***

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to YOSEF KASSA whose telephone number is (703) 306-5918. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, BHAVESH MEHTA can be reached on (703) 308-5246. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2625

numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)

872-9306 for regular communication and (703) 872-9306 for after Final

communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the customer service office whose telephone number is (703) 306-5631. The group receptionist number for TC 2600 is (703) 305-4700.

**PATENT EXAMINER**

Yosef Kassa

07/6/04.



BHAVESH M. MEHTA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600